



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

Society in the "Annual Addresses" of its retiring Presidents. An argument based upon the experience of this old and honored Society, was then offered in favor of a provision in the proceedings of the Association for an annual summary of all that is done in modern philology. A partial summary of this character, for which data had been contributed by others, in accordance with the method employed by the Presidents of the London Society in constructing their "Annual Addresses," was then given in illustration and enforcement of the argument set forth in the introduction. Acknowledgment was made for material furnished for the report on Romanic studies by Prof. A. M. Elliott and Mr. F. M. Warren; on Germanic Studies by Drs. Julius Goebel and H. Wood; on Scandinavian Studies by Mr. Albert E. Egge, and on certain Indo-germanic problems by Dr. Herbert Weir Smyth.

President HENRY E. SHEPHERD (Charleston College), followed with a paper on

2. "A Study of English Prose Style from Elizabeth to Victoria."*

Discussion on this paper was opened by Professor Th. W. Hunt (Princeton), who said: I have been deeply interested in this paper on English Prose, and especially so since it comes from President Shepherd. I do not know how professors of the French and German languages may feel on the subject, but to me there is no province of language-study more interesting or important than that of English prose. I consider the criticism of President Shepherd in regard to Mr. Saintsbury quite sound. I am surprised that Mr. Saintsbury should neglect the process of evolution in our prose. It is necessary to go back as far as Bede and the English Latin-writers, to fix our starting point for English prose. In the middle of the twelfth century we might fix a second date of development. Here the translation of the Bible into English had a great influence on the language. Probably 90% of English words look back to these versions: but more particularly to Wickliffe's translation. I have been giving particular attention to prose, and perhaps may soon afflict the public with a volume. I am happy to see I have held the same opinions, in the main, as Dr. Shepherd. But I think Addison's

*Cf. TRANSACTIONS pp. 22-30, where the essay is given in full.

English is better than modern English, and that no better has been written.

PROF. J. M. GARNETT (University of Virginia): I heartily endorse Dr. Shepherd's views. But can we not go back too far in our discussion of style? The language is quite different if we go beyond the Bible translations. If we start at the fourteenth century with the prose of that time and come on down to the present we have a sure basis, and may readily see the development into the excellent prose style of the second half of the last century. I also am sorry to object to Prof. Shepherd's estimate of Addison's prose.

PROFESOR T. WHITING BANCROFT (Brown University): There is a tendency to abandon the study of the development of our style, possibly from lack of text-books. We study the authors, but no study of authors can take the place of the study of the literature. We hope books on the subject will be furnished. But we would ask all those who may contemplate the making of such books not to make them too learned.

PRESIDENT SHEPHERD: The evolution of our English Prose was begun in the Anglo-Saxon Gospels. They anticipated the later translations. The peculiarity of form was made at this early period. I find my study of the Anglo-Saxon Gospels of great help to me in the appreciative study of our English prose style.

DR. HENRY WOOD (Johns Hopkins University): I preface what I wish to say by referring to Professor Garnett's remark. In fixing our Prose Style we must begin farther back than Wicliffe. Again, the work of studying literary growths is confused with the work of the class-room in University-study. We cannot make this too learned. I quite agree with Prof. Shepherd. In his interesting reference to Euphuism as an attempt at conciseness I think we must treat Euphuism with the doctrine of poetical synonyms. This I hope to show in another place. In considering the prose style, it is necessary to get at the philosophy of the period. Are the authors of any period in the stream of tendency in development of the English prose style? We must find this as the touchstone.

Professor SAMUEL GARNER (Indiana University): I am not a student of English particularly; but it occurred to me to ask the question: May there not, in the matter of style, be shown more individuality in the earlier authors, a stronger ex-

pression of their own nature; while later authors might be copyists in style? This is to be expected. People follow the law of ease of utterance. In early times men would be disposed to follow their instincts. Later writers had greater access to the works of other men; and this must have had its effect.

PRESIDENT SHEPHERD: I think Prof. Garner is right. I have brought this out before. Many passages of Jeremy Taylor, Milton, Browne and such men show the breaking out of the individuality of the writer. Later writers show uniformity and monotony. Macaulay might be said to be beautifully so.

The next communication on the list was by Professor H. C. O. HUSS (Princeton College):

3. "Victor Hugo's Religion as drawn from his Writings," of which the following is an abstract:

I.

When the archbishop of Paris, at the news that V. Hugo's last hour was approaching, called in person at his residence offering to administer to him spiritual aid and the rites of the Catholic church, the poet's kinsman, Mr. Lockroy, is reported to have refused the offer with the words:—"Victor Hugo is expecting death, but he does not desire the services of a priest." The local clerical papers at once declared that Mr. Lockroy had acted arbitrarily in the matter, and yet there is nothing more certain than that the answer given to the bishop was exactly in keeping with Hugo's spirit and convictions as repeatedly and consistently expressed by him throughout his lifetime. For Hugo's religion was not the Catholic religion. Nor was the feeling that he entertained in regard to the Catholic church mere indifference but rather hatred and contempt. The same "Muse of Indignation" which inspires his "Chastisements" against the emperor, dictated his pungent satire, 'The Pope.' The pope, we read in the 'Legend of the Ages,' deceives mankind. "O horror! Satan and he put on the same ring. Jerusalem! they cause thy lamb to be devoured by the old wolf of Rome."

The Eternal City seems to him a rendezvous of all the vilest passions, crimes and vices, of infamy, fraud, perjury and carnal lust, "a prostitute with the tiara on her brow."

"Rome," he declares, "a charnel-house under the eagle, became a bazar under the cross."

Of the officials of the church he says:

"Priests are open abysses; he who looks into them sees horrible things."

"The priest hates and lies."

"Priests make shadow."